



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,987	06/30/2003	Ken Prayoon Cheng	5670-17	1071
20792 7590 06/18/2007 MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627			EXAMINER SINGH, RACHNA	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 10/609,987	Applicant(s) CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner Rachna Singh	Art Unit 2176	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 29 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the recitations of claim 1 that a style sheet is retrieved and associated with the message type of the data record and the selected language is not taught and the claim is being interpreted too broadly. Applicant argues that the MXML document only has an associated message type after programmer designates the message type and therefore the "received data record" does not have a message type association. Examiner respectfully disagrees. See figure 4 where a language independent format is first received, then associated with a locale attribute to provide a textual presentation of the data. In other words, the received data record does have an associated message type. The claim does not necessarily require the message type be sent with the data record, just that the "received data record" comprise a message type at some point before it is displayed. In other words, so long as the received data record has a message type and style sheet associated with it, then the data can be displayed in a selected language. Examiner maintains her interpretation of the claim as recited. Regarding Applicant's argument that even if the interpretation of the claim is maintained, the Vora reference does not teach a message type. Examiner disagrees. Applicant states the output forms are associated with target devices, not the received MXML document. Examiner disagrees. The output documents are generated from the MXML document. Regarding claims 27, 32, 46, and 48, Applicant argues Vora's locale attribute is not included in the MXML document and thus there is no identification of a style sheet. Examiner disagrees. Painter teaches formulating a response to a request for navigation information at a remotely located server when received from an end user which meets the limitation generating data values at the first data processing system. See page 1, paragraph [0002]. Painter then teaches forwarding the navigation information to the customer interface server which meets the limitation forwarding the data record from the first data processing system to the second data processing system". See page 1, paragraphs [0001]-[0005]. Painter teaches retrieving and using an XML style sheet to formulate language and format-specific navigation-related instructions from the language and format-independent responses. See abstract, page 1, paragraph [0005], lines 54-58 and page 2, paragraph [0006]. Painter does not teach the language independent markup document including an identification of a style sheet that specifies how to present the data values in the second language, to provide the data record. However, Vora discloses a symbolic representation of data outputted from an application in a locale-independent representation. The locale-independent representation is in an application markup language comprising a locale attribute that identifies a version of language that is spoken in the locale. See page 1, paragraph [0010]-[0013]. Vora teaches the language independent representation can be translated into a variety of device-specific languages such as HTML, XML, WML, HDML, and VoiceXML. See page 3, paragraphs [0047]-[0049]. See also page 1, paragraphs [0013]-[0016]. In order to translate the document into a specific format or message type, the transformation framework determines the interface receiving the document. The transformation framework also obtains a locale attribute identifying the version of the language spoken at a particular locale. Using the locale attribute and the target device type, MXML document is translated into a device-specific language. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Vora's locale attribute which determines what stylesheet to apply in order to display the data record in a specified language in the system of Painter because doing so helps facilitate globalization of information by allowing an application to be presented in multiple languages. In view of the comments above, the rejection is maintained.

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**